UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,936	02/02/2004	Vlasta Brusic	100172	9573

29050 7590 05/14/2008

STEVEN WESEMAN
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL, I.P.
CABOT MICROELECTRONICS CORPORATION
870 NORTH COMMONS DRIVE
AURORA, IL 60504

EXAMINER	
SMITH, NICHOLAS A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1795	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/769,936	BRUSIC ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NICHOLAS A. SMITH	1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-9,23,24 and 26-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2, 4-9, 23-24 and 26-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 23-24 and 26-27 remain for examination. Claims 28-29 are new.

Renumbering of Claims under Rule 126

2. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

3. Misnumbered claim 28 (the 2nd one) been renumbered 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahalom et al. (US 6,951,599 B2) in view of Champagne et al. (US 5,980,708).

6. In regards to claim(s) 1, Yahalom et al. discloses a method of IR correction in an electrochemical cell, within an electrolyte, at least a working electrode, a counter electrode, and a reference electrode adjacent to the working electrode, and a mechanical abrasion surface adjacent the working electrode, driving a polishing pad in a

rotational motion to provide mechanical polishing within the ECMP cell (Figure 2, col. 4, lines 31-42, col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 24).

7. In regards to claim(s) 1, Yahalom et al. does not explicitly disclose a method comprising measuring a voltage transient between the reference electrode and the working electrode resulting from application of a substantially square step function test signal to the electrochemical cell, deriving from the voltage transient a measure of the resistive impedance of the electrochemical circuit between and including the working electrode and the reference electrode, and subsequently using the measure of resistive impedance to derive an IR correction to the measured voltage between the working electrode and the reference electrode while driving the polishing pad

8. In regards to claim(s) 1, Yahalom et al. discloses the use of a reference electrode in an electrochemical system in order to make in-situ adjustments of electrochemical conditions during electropolishing (col. 4, lines 31-42). Champagne et al. discloses a discloses a method of IR correction in an electrochemical cell, within an electrolyte, at least a working electrode, a counter electrode, and a reference electrode adjacent to the working electrode, comprising measuring a voltage transient between the reference electrode and the working electrode resulting from application of a substantially square step function test signal to the electrochemical cell, deriving from the voltage transient a measure of the resistive impedance of the electrochemical circuit between and including the working electrode and the reference electrode, and subsequently using the measure of resistive impedance to derive an IR correction to the measured voltage between the working electrode and the reference electrode (col. 4, line 18 to col. 8, line 29, Figures

1, 16a-e). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Yahalom et al.'s method of IR correction using Champagne et al.'s method of applying a substantially square step in order to compensate for the ohmic drop in an efficient manner while driving the polishing pad (Champagne et al., col. 4, lines 35-38).

9. In regards to claim(s) 23, Yahalom et al. discloses a method of IR correction in an electrochemical cell, within an electrolyte, at least a working electrode, a counter electrode, and a reference electrode adjacent to the working electrode, and a mechanical abrasion surface adjacent the working electrode, driving a polishing pad in a rotational motion to provide mechanical polishing within the ECMP cell (Figure 2, col. 4, lines 31-42, col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 24).

10. In regards to claim(s) 23, Yahalom et al. does not explicitly disclose a method comprising applying a substantially square step function test signal to the electrochemical cell, measuring a voltage transient between the reference electrode and the working electrode resulting from the application of the test signal the test signal having a start point, wherein the measurement of the voltage transient comprises measuring the voltage between the reference electrode and the working electrode at three times prior to the test signal start point and at three times subsequent to the test signal start point, deriving an extrapolated time-based voltage curve based on the measurements taken subsequent to the test signal start point, deriving from the time-based voltage curve a measure of the resistive impedance of the electrochemical cell circuit between and including the working electrode and the reference electrode and subsequently using the measure of resistive impedance to derive an IR correction to the

measured voltage between the working electrode and the reference electrode while driving the polishing pad

11. In regards to claim(s) 23, Yahalom et al. discloses the use of a reference electrode in an electrochemical system in order to make in-situ adjustments of electrochemical conditions during electropolishing (col. 4, lines 31-42). Champagne et al. discloses a discloses a method of IR correction in an electrochemical cell, within an electrolyte, at least a working electrode, a counter electrode, and a reference electrode adjacent to the working electrode, comprising applying a substantially square step function test signal to the electrochemical cell, measuring a voltage transient between the reference electrode and the working electrode resulting from the application of the test signal the test signal having a start point, wherein the measurement of the voltage transient comprises measuring the voltage between the reference electrode and the working electrode at three times prior to the test signal start point and at three times subsequent to the test signal start point, deriving an extrapolated time-based voltage curve based on the measurements taken subsequent to the test signal start point, deriving from the time-based voltage curve a measure of the resistive impedance of the electrochemical cell circuit between and including the working electrode and the reference electrode and subsequently using the measure of resistive impedance to derive an IR correction to the measured voltage between the working electrode and the reference electrode (col. 4, line 18 to col. 8, line 29, Figures 1, 16a-e). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Yahalom et al.'s method of IR correction using Champagne et al.'s method of applying a substantially square step in

order to compensate for the ohmic drop in an efficient manner while driving the polishing pad (Champagne et al., col. 4, lines 35-38).

12. In regards to claim(s) 2 and 24, Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. discloses a method comprising using the IR correction to produce a corrected voltage that represents the voltage across a substantially capacitive interface between the working electrode and the electrolyte (Yahalom et al., col. 4, line 18 to col. 8, line 29).

13. In regards to claim(s) 4, Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. discloses converting the voltage transient to a digital representation thereof and deriving from the digital representation a measure of the resistive impedance of the cell (Yahalom et al, col. 4, line 18 to col. 8, line 29, Figure 1).

14. In regards to claim(s) 7 and 9, Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. discloses the step of measuring a voltage transient between the reference electrode and the working electrode comprises measuring the voltage between the reference electrode and the working electrode prior to, during, and after the transient and such measurements are taken at substantially the same resolution (Yahalom et al., col. 4, line 18 to col. 8, line 29, Figures 1, 16a-e).

15. Claims 5-6 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. and in further view of Weihs et al. (US 6,171,467) as submitted on 2 February 2004 in Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement.

16. In regards to claim(s) 5-6 and 26-27, Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. does not specifically disclose an active step of controlling the voltage across the substantially capacitive interface to within a predetermined value.

17. Weihs et al. discloses an electrochemical polishing system. Weihs et al. teaches that controlled voltage allows growth of a layer (col. 3, lines 24-48), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. with Weihs et al.'s control of voltage in order to allow growth of a layer (Weihs et al., col. 3, lines 24-48). While Weihs et al. does not specifically disclose the variance at which the voltage is controlled, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to acknowledge that one would want to keep a constant value as much as is possible to for film/layer uniformity. Furthermore, in regards to claim(s) 6 and 27, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to control the voltage as tightly as possible in Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. and in further view of Weihs et al.'s method because Weihs et al. teaches that controlled voltage allows growth of a layer (Weihs et al., col. 3, lines 24-28)and more tightly controlled growth of a layer is desired (Weihs et al., abstract).

18. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. and in further view of Laletin et al. (US 2004/0128088 A1).

19. Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. does not specifically disclose making measurements with different temporal resolution before or after a square step.

20. Laletin et al. discloses method of changing temporal resolution in electrochemical analysis systems and discloses a higher temporal resolution during the scanning of the active region (paragraph [0130]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a higher scan rates during the "active" portion of the electrochemical process as taught by Laletin et al. in that it is more effective to have a lower data volume at during non-active data collection (Laletin et al., paragraph [0130]).

21. Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. and in further view of "Faraday 1 User's Manual," published by *Obbligato Objectives, Inc.* (2000) (*Faraday*).

22. In regards to claim(s) 28-29, Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. does not explicitly suggest, teach or disclose a method wherein a potentiostat in an IR correction method would have its output modified by a current limiter while applying a small square step function voltage perturbation to the potentiostat input.

23. *Faraday* discloses a potentiostat for electrochemical processes (p. 1). *Faraday* discloses a potentiostat that is current limited (p. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al.'s method with *Faraday*'s current limiting in order to keep common electroanalytical levels for safety (*Faraday*, p. 2). Therefore, Yahalom et al. in view of Champagne et al. in view of *Faraday*'s potentiostat's output would be modified by a current limiter. Furthermore, the resulting output would be formed into a substantially square step function if modified by a current limiter when a small square step function voltage perturbation is the input and therefore meets the claimed limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

24. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

25. The term "small" in claims 28-29 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "small" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's amendment to the claims necessitated the new grounds of rejection

Conclusion

27. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

28. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS A. SMITH whose telephone number is (571)272-8760. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday.

30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Susy Tsang-Foster can be reached on (571)-272-1293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

31. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NAS
/Susy N Tsang-Foster/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795